

The School of the Month program highlights schools with outstanding students, teachers and administrators. Each month, McCarthy will recognize a different school that demonstrates a unique contribution to Long Island education.

TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. HERBERT D. VALENTINE

**HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the work and life of the Rev. Dr. Herbert D. Valentine, who next month will be retiring as the Executive Presbyter of the Presbytery of Baltimore.

Dr. Valentine has held the position of Executive Presbyter for 23 years, serving his faith and his convictions. Dr. Valentine has been instrumental in working for better human rights policy, for better treatment of children and families and policies that speak to the better side of our nature. His work in Baltimore has spoken to the needs and aspirations of all peoples, near and far.

Dr. Valentine's commitment to strengthening ecumenical and interfaith relationships was recognized by the Central Maryland Ecumenical Council in 1995 with their Bryce Shoemaker Ecumenical Leadership Award. Prior to that, Dr. Valentine was honored by the Presbytery when he was elected to serve as moderator of their 203rd General Assembly in 1991-1992. In this capacity, Dr. Valentine traveled around the world representing Presbyterians and sharing his faith.

Throughout his lifetime, Dr. Valentine has demonstrated deep concern for all victims of oppression and injustice, not only in Baltimore but throughout the global community, especially in Central America. A visit from Dr. Valentine and other members of the Baltimore Presbytery, always meant that I would get educated as to the needs of people in distress or despair. We agreed more often than not as to the action our country had to take to assist these efforts to elevate the condition of all peoples.

Dr. Valentine's strong faith and advocacy will be missed, but I am sure he would not be leaving without a well trained and compassionate replacement—I know his coworkers are well prepared to continue his work. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Dr. Valentine for his service to his faith and his community and to wish him fair winds and a following sea as he enjoys his retirement.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE RETIREMENT EQUALITY ACT OF 2000

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the District of Columbia Police Retirement

Equality Act of 2000, a bill to provide equity in retirement benefits for Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) officers. This bill would correct an inequity by granting MPD officers and increase in retirement benefits based on the value of longevity bonus pay comparable to those received by D.C. firefighters.

Longevity pay, adopted by the District in 1972, is a bonus granted to both police officers and firefighters, in addition to base salary, as a retention incentive after officers reach milestones in service of fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, and thirty years. A D.C. firefighter, whose retirement benefits are identical in every other aspect to those of a MPD officer, receives a retirement annuity based on the combined value of base salary and longevity bonus pay. An MPD officer's retirement annuity is based only on base salary, not the longevity bonus, and is therefore lower than that of a D.C. firefighter. This benefit was negotiated by D.C. firefighters as part of a 1993 collective bargaining agreement. By 1995, MPD officials were not able to negotiate the same benefit because the District had entered into financial crisis and was essentially insolvent. The District has recovered and has had balanced budgets and surpluses for three years. MPD officers attempted to gain equal retirement benefits with D.C. firefighters through the 1997 Revitalization Act, in which the federal government assumed full responsibility for the District's unfunded pension liability for teacher's, firefighters and police officers. At that time, Representative CONNIE MORELLA, who is an original cosponsor of this bill and has constituents affected by this inequity, introduced legislation similar to the bill I introduced today. That bill was not adopted at that time.

Since then, the Council, the Mayor, and the control board have agreed to pay for this increased annuity benefit if the federal government agrees to pay for the portion of the program that would have been incurred prior to the 1997 Revitalization Act and therefore assumed by the federal government as is the case with firefighters.

This bill amends the 1997 Revitalization Act by authorizing the federal government to pay for the additional pension liability accrued prior to 1997 for police officers. The city will pay for the increased benefits accrued since the 1997 Revitalization Act. All officers retiring before enactment of the Police Retirement Act will receive the retirement benefits at the current level. Only officers retiring after this legislation is passed would be eligible for the increased annuity.

There was no intention to leave police officers worse off than firefighters in this city. Police officers should not have lower retirement pay because their collective bargaining agreement was negotiated at a low point in the city's financial picture, while the firefighters got in just under the wire. At a time when Chief Charles Ramsey is upgrading the quality of police officers, and even bringing in experienced officers on a lateral basis, we need true equity if we want a first-class police department. The retirement pay differential may be an anomaly, but its resulting unfairness hurts not only individual officers but public safety in the city. The city is willing to pay its share to correct this inequity. The Congress must do the same.

I would like to thank Representative TOM DAVIS, Chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee, Representatives STENY HOYER, CONNIE MORELLA, and AL WYNN for being original cosponsors of this bill to restore basic parity to the retirements of District police officers and firefighters, and urge swift passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JIM McDERMOTT**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and unable to vote from March 21, 2000 to March 24, 2000 because I accompanied the President of the United States on his historic visit to India and Pakistan.

On March 21, 2000:

I would have voted in favor of H. Con. Res. 288 (Roll Call number 56).

I would have voted in favor of H. Res. 182 (Roll Call number 57).

On March 22, 2000:

I would have voted in favor of approving the journal (Roll Call number 58).

I would have voted against on ordering the Previous Question H. Res. 444 (Roll Call number 59).

I would have voted against on agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 444 (Roll Call number 60).

I would have voted against considering S. 1287 (Roll Call number 61).

I would have voted in favor of recommitting S. 1287 with Instructions (Roll Call number 62).

I would have voted against S. 1287 (Roll Call number 63).

I would have voted against ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 445 (Roll Call number 64).

I would have voted for passage of H.R. 3822 (Roll Call number 65).

March 23, 2000:

I would have voted in favor of approving the Journal (Roll Call number 66).

I would have voted against the previous question on H. Res. 446 (Roll Call number 67).

I would have voted against the amended H. Res. 446 (Roll Call number 68).

I would have voted against the motion to rise on H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 69).

I would have voted in favor of the Owens substitute to H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 70).

I would have voted in favor of the DeFazio substitute to H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 71).

I would have voted in favor of the Stenholm substitute to H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 72).

I would have voted against Sununu amendment to H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 73).

I would have voted in favor of the Spratt substitute to H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 74).

March 24, 2000:

I would have voted against H. Con. Res. 290 (Roll Call number 75).